

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,829	08/28/2003	Wataru Taki	2936-0194P 6644	
2292	7590 02/22/2005		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STE PO BOX 747	WART KOLASCH &	NGUYEN, MINH T		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2816	-
		DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	.,	TAKI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	10/649,829 Examiner	Art Unit			
	Minh Nguyen	2816			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	side(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Fe	ebruary 2005.				
·- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
· -	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 4-7 and 11-18 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) 4-7 and 11-18 is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) \boxtimes The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 August 2003</u> is/are: a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)	,				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	ite				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2816

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/7/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-7 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,517,685, issued to Aoyama et al. in view of Humphries et al (Industrial electronics, Breton Publishers, 1983, chapter 2, page 38).

As per claim 4, Aoyama discloses a frequency conversion apparatus (Fig. 3), comprising: a filter (HPF 21) having a fixed cut-off frequency for restricting a band of a reception signal (filter HPF 21 is fixed, the recited function is merely the function of a filter, HPF 21

Art Unit: 2816

receives the reception signal at input node INPUT SIGNAL) so as to selectively pass only a first frequency band component;

an amplifier (22) for amplifying the reception signal having passed through the filter; a variable filter (variable BPF 23) having a variable cut-off frequency for further restricting the band of the reception signal having been amplified by the amplifier (as shown, the BPF 23 receives the signal from the amplifier 22), so as to cut off at least part of the first frequency band component and thereby to selectively pass only a second frequency band component (this is merely the function of a filter); and

a mixer (MIXER 25) for mixing the reception signal having passed through the variable filter with a local oscillation signal (the signal is generated by the VCO 27),

wherein the amplifier cuts off reflected waves that fall outside a pass band of the variable filter (this limitation is met because there is no input port from the variable BPF 23 to the amplifier 22) and

wherein the cut-off frequency of the variable filter being controlled to vary according to a reception channel signal (the channel selection command).

Further, Aoyama explicitly discloses the variable filter is a band pass filter (BPF).

Aoyama does not explicitly disclose the variable filter is built by serially connecting together a variable low-pass filter for selectively passing only a low band component of a signal inputted thereto and a variable high-pass filter for selectively passing only a high band component of a signal inputted thereto as called for in the claim.

Humphries explicitly discloses a band pass filter is merely a combination of a lowpass filter and a highpass filter cascaded (page 38, column 1). In other words, a variable bandpass

Art Unit: 2816

filter is art recognized equivalent with a variable lowpass filter and a variable highpass filter serially connected.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the Aoyama's variable bandpass by serially connecting together a variable low-pass filter and a variable high-pass filter.

The motivation and/or suggestion would be to allow the user more control of the frequency band of the spectrum by independently controlling the variable lowpass filter and the variable highpass filter.

As per claim 5, Aoyama discloses a frequency conversion apparatus which comprises elements and structure discussed in claim 4 herein above wherein the variable filter is a bandpass filter (BPF). Also discussed in claim 4, the bandpass filter is built using a variable low-pass filter and a variable high-pass filter serially connected. Further, Aoyama teaches the frequency conversion apparatus is used as a tuner in cable television CATV (column 1, line 18).

Aoyama does not explicitly disclose the variable filter is a highpass filter as called for in the claim.

However, as known by a person having an average skill in the art, when more channels are available, the frequency band of the variable bandpass filter must be made wider to accommodate more channels. When the frequency band is required to be much wider, the existing of a lowpass filter has little meaning. In this situation, eliminating the variable lowpass filter would result in cost saving without severely effecting the performance of the tuner.

Art Unit: 2816

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to eliminate the variable lowpass filter in the frequency conversion apparatus discussed in claim 4. The motivation and/or suggestion would be to reduce the cost of the implementation.

As per claim 6, the recited limitation is disclosed in Fig. 3, i.e., the PLL circuit 35.

As per claim 7, because the PLL circuit 35 is controlled by the CHANNEL SELECTION COMMAND inputted to the PLL circuit 35, the recited limitation is met. In other words, the CHANNEL SELECTION COMMAND inputted to the divider circuit 30 would control the voltage at the output of the LPF 34 to alter the frequency of the local oscillation signal generated by the VCO 27.

As per claims 11-12, these claims are merely methods to operate the circuits having the structures discussed in claims 4-5, respectively. Since the structures discussed in claims 4-5 are disclosed, the methods to operate are seen as obvious.

As per claims 13-14, these claims are rejected for the same reasons noted in claims 6-7, respectively.

As per claims 15-16, these claims are rejected for the same reasons noted in claims 6-7, respectively.

As per claims 17-18, these claims are rejected for the same reasons noted in claims 6-7, respectively.

3. Claims 4-7 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,112,070, issued to Katsuyama et al. in view of Humphries et al (Industrial electronics, Breton Publishers, 1983, chapter 2, page 38).

Art Unit: 2816

As per claim 4, Katsuyama discloses a frequency conversion apparatus (Fig. 1), comprising:

a filter (BPF 2A) having a fixed cut-off frequency for restricting a band of a reception signal (filter BPF 2A is fixed, the received function is merely the function of a filter, BPF 2A receives the reception signal from the antenna ANT 1) so as to selectively pass only a first frequency band component;

an amplifier (LNA 3) for amplifying the reception signal having passed through the filter, a variable filter (variable BPF 4) having a variable cut-off frequency for further restricting the band of the reception signal having been amplified by the amplifier (as shown, the BPF 4 receives the signal from the amplifier LNA 3), so as to cut off at least part of the first frequency band component and thereby to selectively pass only a second frequency band component (this is merely the function of a filter); and

a mixer (MIX 5) for mixing the reception signal having passed through the variable filter with a local oscillation signal (the signal is generated by the VCO 8),

wherein the amplifier cuts off reflected waves that fall outside a pass band of the variable filter (this limitation is met because there is no input port from the variable BPF 4 to the amplifier LNA 3) and

wherein the cut-off frequency of the variable filter being controlled to vary according to a reception channel signal (the selected channel).

Further, Katsuyama explicitly discloses the variable filter is a bandpass filter (BPF 4).

Katsuyama does not explicitly disclose the variable filter is built by serially connecting together a variable low-pass filter for selectively passing only a low band component of a signal

Art Unit: 2816

inputted thereto and a variable high-pass filter for selectively passing only a high band component of a signal inputted thereto as called for in the claim.

Humphries explicitly discloses a bandpass filter is merely a combination of a lowpass filter and a highpass filter cascaded (page 38, column 1). In other words, a variable bandpass filter is art recognized equivalent with a variable lowpass filter and a variable highpass filter serially connected.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the Katsuyama's variable bandpass by serially connecting together a variable low-pass filter and a variable high-pass filter.

The motivation and/or suggestion would be to allow the user more control of the frequency band of the spectrum by independently controlling the variable lowpass filter and the variable highpass filter.

As per claim 5, Katsuyama discloses a frequency conversion apparatus which comprises elements and structure discussed in claim 4 herein above wherein the variable filter is a bandpass filter (BPF 4). Also discussed in claim 4, the bandpass filter is built using a variable low-pass filter and a variable high-pass filter serially connected. Further, Katsuyama teaches the frequency conversion apparatus is used as a tuner in mobile communication (the title).

Katsuyama does not explicitly disclose the variable filter is a highpass filter as called for in the claim.

However, as known by a person having an average skill in the art, when more channels are available, the frequency band of the variable bandpass filter must be made wider to accommodate more channels. When the frequency band is required to be much wider, the

Art Unit: 2816

existing of a lowpass filter has little meaning. In this situation, eliminating the variable lowpass filter would result in cost saving without severely effecting the performance of the tuner.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to eliminate the variable lowpass filter in the frequency conversion apparatus discussed in claim 4. The motivation and/or suggestion would be to reduce the cost of the implementation.

As per claim 6, the recited limitation is disclosed in Fig. 1, i.e., the PLL circuit 9.

As per claim 7, because the PLL circuit 9 is controlled by the CPU; the recited limitation is met.

As per claims 11-12, these claims are merely methods to operate the circuits having the structures discussed in claims 4-5, respectively. Since the structures discussed in claims 4-5 are disclosed, the methods to operate are seen as obvious.

As per claims 13-14, these claims are rejected for the same reasons noted in claims 6-7, respectively.

As per claims 15-16, these claims are rejected for the same reasons noted in claims 6-7, respectively.

As per claims 17-18, these claims are rejected for the same reasons noted in claims 6-7, respectively.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1748. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 7:00-5:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/649,829 Page 9

Art Unit: 2816

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Callahan can be reached on 571-272-1740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Minh Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 2816

2/16/05